



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,372	03/09/2004	James K. Kebinger	POU920030176US1	2280

23334 7590 10/30/2008
FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

PICH, PONNOREAY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2435

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoboca@fggbb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/796,372	Applicant(s) KEBINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner PONNOREAY PICH	Art Unit 2435	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-13 and 15-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 14 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending and were examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

The documents crossed out in the IDS submitted on 10/15/08 were crossed out because the documents were listed in a previously submitted IDS and do not need to be listed again. These documents were previously considered.

Response to Amendment and Arguments

Applicant's amendments were fully considered. Applicant's arguments directed at the amended claims were also fully considered, but are moot in view of new rejections made below in response to the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 9-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rangan et al (US 2002/0184534).

Claims 1, 9, and 15:

As per claim 1, Rangan discloses:

1. Receiving login information from the user, the login information including the first username, an alternate class, and a password, the first user name and the alternate class being received as part of a user identification input of the login

Art Unit: 2435

information entered by the user (Fig 2 and paragraphs 23, 27, 29, and 31-32).

Rangan's invention provides a way in which one or more users can manage their user id and passwords for various destinations found in the network seen in Figure 1. As seen in Figure 2, some of these destinations such as LBC.com and Airline.com can have a common first user name (i.e. John Doe) associated with both of the destinations. As such, a first user name (i.e. John Doe) is associated with a first class of users (i.e. the class of users having an account with LBC.com) and an alternate class of users (i.e. the class of users having an account with Airline.com). Paragraph 32 discusses that the portal page seen in Figure 2 had the information seen therein entered by the user, thus Rangan's invention received login information from the user as recited in claim 1.

2. Authenticating the user based on the first username and the password (paragraph 12).
3. Providing access to the computer system (i.e. the network as seen in Figure 1) as the alternate class (paragraphs 12 and 30).
4. Wherein the alternate class is different than the first class (Fig 1 and paragraphs 27 and 29-30). *As discussed above already, users having an account with LBC.com and Airline.com (as an example) are considered different classes of users. However, as seen in Figure 2, it is possible for users of both classes to have at least one user whose user name is the same for both sites.*

Art Unit: 2435

Claim 9 is directed towards a computer program product comprising a storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Since Rangan's invention is implemented via a computer system, a computer program product comprising a storage medium as recited in claim 9 is inherent to Rangan's invention.

Claim 15 is directed towards a system having an interface and processor for performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Since the user is able to enter and edit his/her user id and password in Rangan's invention (paragraph 32), this implies there being an interface receiving login information from the user as claimed. Since Rangan's invention is implemented using a computer system, it has a processor as claimed since all computer systems have processors.

Claims 2, 10 and 16:

Rangan further discloses wherein the login information includes a second username entered by the user as part of the user identification input in addition to the first username and the alternate class, and in the providing step, access to the computer system is provided (by the processor) with the rights and privileges of the second user name (Fig 2 and paragraphs 3, 29, and 32).

Claims 3, 11, and 17:

Rangan further discloses verifying that the user is authorized to be provided access to the computer system as the alternate class, wherein the providing step is only performed if the user's authorization is verified (paragraphs 12, and 29-30).

Art Unit: 2435

Claim 4:

Rangan further discloses wherein the verifying step includes the sub-step of looking up the first username in an identity switching authorization table (paragraphs 12 and 29-30).

Claims 5, 12, and 18:

Rangan further discloses wherein the providing step includes the sub-step of presenting the user with a user interface of the alternate class after login (paragraph 3).

Claims 6, 13, and 19:

Rangan further discloses wherein in the providing step the processor provides the user with the experience of a user in the alternate class (paragraph 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al (US 2002/0184534) in view of (US 6,088,451).

Claim 8:

Rangan does not explicitly disclose the step of recording an audit trail that includes at least some of the actions performed by the first user, the audit trail including

Art Unit: 2435

the first username. However, He discloses the limitation (col 10, line 49-col 11, line 6 and col 23, lines 30-36).

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Rangan's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 8 in light of He's teachings. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because use of auditing as taught by He would provide means for detecting malicious attempts to circumvent security mechanisms (He: col 10, lines 49-52).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 14, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2435

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PONNOREAY PICH whose telephone number is (571)272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-4:30pm Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ponnoreay Pich/
Examiner, Art Unit 2435
/Kimyen Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431